LITERARY MISCELLANY.

For the National Era.

HOLLY-WOOD.

BY ALICE CAREY.

CHAP. I.

"The sun goes down, and a bright wake runs along the blue for a little while, showing us the way he went; but presently the shadows close together—close silently, and all traces of him are lost.

"But the many stars rise and set, and few are the eyes observant of their glory, or of their fading and going down. Millions are struggling for the high places of the world—shouting to be heard of the ages; but across how many flat and forgotten graves, round the few echoes which are immortal.

"Yet how hard it is to feel the world could do as well without us—to know how little and how unworthy we are; how hard to believe the great tumults of action are less than a quiet and well-ordered life, and that little things, after all, fulfill our needs.

"The linnet must not mate itself with the steady-winged eagle, nor must the milkmaid wring the dew from her hair, because of the golden flowers about the foreheads of princesses; these things we learn too late, many of us, and, from the downhill of life, see what green and pleasant places we have passed unnoticed.

"As I look back from this descent, I see one sheltering nook, where my hair would not have faded as it is faded now, where the heat would have fallen less oppressively, and where the labors that I have borne alone might have been shared. It is too late—these reflections cannot benefit me now—and yet it pleases me to recount the little story of my life—its large hope and little power—the fever, the fret, the subsiding calm.

"There is no dark mystery to unfold; it is a simple, commonplace narrative; and if you expect anything exciting and adventurous—anything at all romantic—it were better to amuse your leisure in some other way than in listening to me."

In the foregoing, is the substance of what Mary Halstead said to me, when I asked her why she was never married.

We were sitting in her elegantly-furnished parlor, alone—a quiet, hazy, October day was past, and the last sunset light fell across a fine picture of the Magdalen, when she hears the "Neither do I condemn thee," and pushes back a little the heavy masses of her hair, to steal one look of Him who was without sin. Our faces were toward the painter's beautiful creation, and till the lessening light was quite gone, we remained still—tears gathering to the usually cold eyes of my friend—for Genius, when it will, can reach its hand out of the grave, and touch the heart. And then it was that, rather to break up the sad feeling which was coming down with the night, than from any idle curiosity, I inquired how it happened she was never married. We are friends—she calls me, indeed, her best friend—and yet till that evening I had never seen her in a mood that would have warranted such a question. She pointed to a stool at her feet, and, sitting there, I laid my head on her knees; and putting her arm across my neck, rather as a resting-place for it than from any love of me, as it seemed, she told me the story which follows, introducing it with the half soliloquy which opens this chapter.

Mary Halstead is rich, beautiful, proud, and an actress. She is followed, flattered, envied, and disliked; for to most persons, if not cold and haughty, she is at least distant and incommunicative. There are no illustrious names in the background of the picture where her stately beauty shines so peerless; from the knees of a good but simple-minded mother, she descended, and, pushing aside her wondering brothers and sisters, took the bright and lonesome path that runs close along the borders of fame. There, dissatisfied, unloved, cold, glittering, she stands. With all her strength and all her daring, there are summits that baffle her. Before the foot-lights she hears shouts of admiration, and stands among tributes of flowers; but she feels, after all, that the buffoon who succeeds her will receive the same applause, and that her gorgeous trains are but poor semblances of a real splendor.

In her style of living she is profuse, but not truly elegant, for early habits are not thrown aside like a garment, and no subsequent training can atone for neglect in childhood.

In dress she is extravagant and careless; in manner as nearly conformed to polite requisitions as her haughtiness will permit; but the formula of society ill becomes her, and on the boards she is, perhaps, less an actress than elsewhere. There, she is refined back to nature, and rises at once to the sublimest heights of womanhood; heights, from the basis of which the eager multitude look up and worship. But the admiration seldom reaches beyond the scenic display, and if it does, is surely destined to be wounded against some sharp angle of her character; for, though she stood in the way of the earth's motion, she would not turn aside. In person she is tall, majestically straight, and apparently sound as the oak sapling. Her complexion is pale, as it were sicklied with the hue of some oppressive thought, and on either cheek there is always a bright flush, seeming rather the burning outward of an inward fire, than the fresh, open blossom of health. Her forehead is low and smooth, the nose straight, and lips thin, showing but seldom the even white teeth

Her hair is black, blacker than coal or jet, and, though she calls it faded, and fading, as may have been noticed, not a white thread is visible. Heavily and simply, but tastefully worn, it is, perhaps, her greatest crown of beauty. In color, her eyes are of a deep blue, and in expression rather speculative than affectionate. But in her smile, and she smiles often, there is a fascination almost irresistible, despite the repelling eyes and the upright and self-sufficient bearing. Past the hey-day of youth, she is yet within the precincts of blooming womanhood, and though she speaks of herself as in the downhill of life, she is old rather by experience than years.

I said we were alone; but Hetty, Mary's hunchback sister, sat a little apart from us, knitting a purse, and scarcely lifting her eyes from her work. She saw not the sunset, nor the Magdalen, nor the white moon wading up through the haze; she had, haply, some picture in her heart.

So there we were, in the fine parlor of the popular actress—home comforts and home splendors all about us, and a little way off the great busy city, with its thousands of interests and pleasures; and she who could command the subserviency of any or all of these, turned regretfully to the hard and homely life, which the world says is so far below her present position.

"Hetty, my darling, make the tea; none is so nice as that which you prepare. And my poor narrative possesses little interest for you, who were my playmate, and are my housemate still—dear, good Hetty."

The girl smiled, and, putting down her knitting, rose to obey, but the next moment took it up again, and smiling and knitting as she went, left us alone.

"Poor dear Hetty!" reiterated Mary again, "her patience and meekness are a constant reproach to me; and if my fears are boding right, it were better she had not been born."

I knew not, at the time, what her apprehensions were, but they will be unfolded in the course of the history.

You say I am to be envied, that the round of my ambition is full—that my train disdains to touch the "summer-smelling flowers"—and this last is perhaps true, for though my frown made everlasting winter, I would get frowns sometimes; but as for success, to ourselves we are never successful, and for that which you call triumph I have paid dearly—every step has been, as it were, on a grave-mound; for if woman look beyond the household and its sweet domestic affections for happiness, she must tread, not only on the hearts of others, but also on her own.

You must not think I have been cruel by premeditation; but whoever fixes on an object, for the attainment of which, whatever comes between must be sacrificed, is necessarily cruel.

There were springs of ambition in my nature, set loose by the hand that might have sealed them forever; so, if the good ground has been washed away and left me hard and barren, I am not altogether to blame. So, at least, I try to excuse my faults and failings, and I have my share.

[CHAP. I TO BE CONCLUDED IN OUR NEXT]

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MONDAY, JULY 3, 1854.

☞ We restrict ourselves for the sake of presenting to our readers the first half of Mr. Sumner's triumphant speech, delivered last Wednesday in the Senate. The rest will appear after the 4th of July, as there will be no paper issued to-morrow. Printers are always patriotic.

CONGRESS.

Both Houses adjourned on Saturday until Wednesday, July 5th.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT,

By and with the advice and consent of the Senate

FOR THE TERRITORY OF NEBRASKA.

William O. Butler, of Kentucky, to be Governor.

Thomas B. Cumming, of Iowa, to be Secretary.

Fenner Ferguson, of Michigan, to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Edwin R. Hardin, of Georgia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

James Bradley, of Indiana, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Experience Estabrook, of Wisconsin, to be Attorney.

Mark W. Izard, of Arkansas, to be Marshal.

FOR THE TERRITORY OF KANSAS.

Andrew H. Reeder, of Pennsylvania, to be Governor.

Daniel Woodson, of Virginia, to be Secretary.

Madison Brown, of Maryland, to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Sanders W. Johnson, of Ohio, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Rush Elmore, of Alabama, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Andrew J. Isaacs, of Louisiana, to be Attorney.

J. B. Donaldson, of Louisiana, to be Marshal.

Three slaveholding and four non-slaveholding appointments in Nebraska, the important ones of Governor and Marshal being assigned to the Slave States. As to Kansas, the character of the appointments demonstrates the design to favor the institution and establishment of Slavery there—five slaveholders, only two non-slaveholders, and of these, Mr. Reeder, the Governor, is from Pennsylvania, among the free States, the Keystone of Slavery. Every branch of the Executive department is placed under the control of the Slave Interest. The Washington *Sentinel* says, from all it can learn, Mr. Reeder "is a sound constitutional Democrat, unbiased by sectional prejudice." We all know what this means. But, the *Sentinel*, not content that the Attorney, the Marshal, the Chief Judge, and a majority of the Court, and the Secretary, are from the Slave States, insists that a *Southern Governor* ought to have been appointed for the Territory, *whose domestic institutions and interests would be congenial with his own.* It is instructive to see how confidently these slaveholders speak. By the way, we can gratify the *Sentinel* by informing its editor that S. W. Johnson, credited to Ohio, is a Kentuckian, and a doughty pro-slavery man.

There was no necessity for dividing the Territory of Nebraska—one Government, everybody knows, would have sufficed for the whole. The object of Mr. Douglas and Mr. Atchison, in cutting off that portion of it directly west of Missouri, and giving it a separate Territorial Government, was to force the introduction of Slavery. Keeping this object solely in view, President Pierce has taken all its officers from the South, except one, and he is selected from Pennsylvania, whose votes carried the Bill, and is pronounced trustworthy by the *Sentinel.*

We talk of the Slavery Propagandism of the South, but it finds its principal agents in the North. Pierce and Douglas are its pioneers in Kansas.

THE FOREIGN NEWS—RELATION OF GREAT BRITAIN TO CANADA.

By the Europa we have intelligence from the seat of war, to the 9th of June. It is but the old story—nothing decisive. The Russians have not been dislodged—Silistria has not been taken—there has been no signal engagement on land or water. A Paris correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, who has seen a letter, dated at Constantinople, from Col. Banks, An American officer, now in the service of the Turks, says that the Colonel charges the English and French papers with exaggerating, for the purpose of keeping up the warfare at home. The submission of the Greeks, he represents as one of compulsion. They arouse the English and French to a war, and yet the London and Paris journals report that King Otho and his subjects are overjoyed at the intentions of the allies. According to the Colonel, the majority of successes so far have been on the side of the Russians; the Turkish reports of immense losses on the part of the enemy are exaggerations; and that the Turkish army of Asia is in so critical a condition, that unless reinforced it will be cut to pieces.

"There are 250,000 Russians on Turkish soil, while opposed to them are at present but 60,000 English and French, and 120,000 Turks. This force, united and strongly intrenched, can act on the defensive; but as for acting on the offensive, he considers it impossible. They may defend the passage of the Balkans, but they cannot drive the Russians out of the Principalities."

We fear there is too much truth in all this.

The most interesting portion of the news by the Europa relates to a short but piquant debate in the British House of Lords, on the 14th June, on the second reading of the CANADIAN LEGISLATIVE COLONIAL BILL. The Duke of Newcastle having stated that the object of the bill is to repeal those clauses in the Union act which prohibit legislation in the Canadian Parliament on the subject of a Legislative Council, and to leave the Colonial Legislature entirely free to act as they see fit in relation to the creation of a second chamber, Lord ELLENBOROUGH took occasion to announce his views in favor of the INDEPENDENCE of the COLONIES. As Lord Ellenborough belongs to the higher aristocracy of the realm, and is a Tory in his politics, his views are the more significant.

That countries, so extensive, so full of resources, so rapidly growing in population and wealth, as the British provinces in America, should much longer continue in a condition of Colonial subjection, no man of intelligence and forecast can suppose. The most enlightened statesmen of England must contemplate the probability of this event, and certainly the policy of their Government seems to be shaped so as to facilitate the change, and make it as little inconvenient to both parties as may be.

The Independence of the Colonies will by no means involve annexation to this country. They begin to feel their power; they know that they have a basis for their empire larger even than the area of the United States; with more pride and self-confidence than they possessed when comparatively feeble, they may see nothing in annexation to this country to compensate them for the loss of that distinct nationality which has already sprung up among them. Besides, the public sentiment of the Colonies is so strong against Slavery, that their people revolt at the idea of involving themselves in any way in its support, especially by assuming the obligation of the infamous Fugitive Slave Act. That measure has done more than anything else, to check and abate the popular feeling in favor of annexation, which prevailed four or five years ago. Of course, should there be a dissolution of the Union between the free and slave States, a union of Canada with the former would soon follow, as a natural consequence.

There can be no doubt that Slaveholding Statesmen look with extreme jealousy on every movement calculated to increase the friendly feelings between the Northern States and the Canadas, and multiply their business and social ties. For this reason, the Fishery and Reciprocity Treaty, adjusting, as it does, all important questions of controversy between Great Britain and the United States, admirably adapted to perpetuate their peaceful relations, and providing for interests of immense magnitude, without sacrifice to the local interests of any section, will encounter, we apprehend, determined resistance in the Senate. Indeed, we must express our doubt whether the Slavery Propagandists in that body will not rally a majority against its ratification.

DEATH OF THOMAS RITCHIE, ESQ

We learn that the venerable Thomas Ritchie died at his residence in this city at half past 12 o'clock to-day.

WASHINGTON CITY.

A glowing sun and a light breeze to-day—the thermometer at 90, at half past two o'clock. Quiet reigns over the city. The Capitol displays no flags, and the crowds have failed to assemble near the hotel doors. Nor do we hear of much preparation for the celebration of to-morrow. The health of the city is good, though one physician, we are told, reports two cases of cholera morbus, with symptoms of a severe type.

☞ A New York paper says that the people who crowd the court-room, and listen eagerly to the disgusting testimony in the Walker divorce case, are the very sort of people who would go to sleep in church. Heavy-headed folks in church should hereafter look to it, lest the worst of inferences be drawn from their dozing tendencies.

TELEGRAPH TO HAGERSTOWN, MD.—A despatch from Hagerstown, on the 2d, says:

"The telegraph line to this place, connecting us with Baltimore, was opened at 2 o'clock yesterday, and we feel as if we had been removed twenty miles further East. Out of the range of railroads and telegraphs, we have hitherto been cut off from the 'faster' portions of creation, and look upon the telegraph as the first step towards the amelioration of our isolated condition."

HOT WEATHER.—A New Orleans despatch of the 29th, says:

"The weather is the hottest ever known here, the thermometer reaching 100 degrees in the shade. Eight cases of sunstroke have occurred."

MEMPHIS MUNICIPAL ELECTION.—At the municipal election on the 30th ultimo, the Know-Nothings elected their candidate for mayor and all the city officers, by handsome majorities.

☞ Josiah Emory, late postmaster of New Vineyard, in Maine, has been sent to the State's prison for ten years, for purloining letters.

THE COWARD AND CONVICT.—John Mitchel, the Vitriolist, speaks of the inglorious slave catcher who was recently sent to his own place from Boston, as an Irishman, "who took the side of justice and the Constitution." He calls the citizens of Boston "howling and cowardly rioters," and indulges in the most approved style of Van Dieman literature, concerning the "brutish mob" who killed the law-abiding Irishman.

Hear what the patriot says: "We congratulate our countrymen, particularly the Irish military company, which was ordered out on the occasion on being 'hissed loudly' by the sneaking ruffians who assailed the court-house, and were driven away by a mere handful of men, in the honest discharge of their duty."

This is the language of a fugitive from service—a refugee from oppression—*a lover of Liberty.* We once sympathized with the fellow, believing him to be sincere in his advocacy of the eternal principles of universal liberty. But now that the mask is removed, and the sunlight flashes upon his every feature, we can read his true character. He has proved himself a miserable miscreant, one who has no self-respect, and therefore no respect for others.

Among the Irish who come here to seek Liberty, we number our most virulent enemies, our most relentless oppressors. They seem to hate us with a perfect hatred. They ought to know, if they do not, that "niggers and Irishmen," in this country, are both in the dust; "a fellow-feeling should therefore make us wondrous kind."—*Fred. Douglass's Paper.*

THE FOURTH OF JULY.

In compliance with the general usage, the office of the *National Era* will be closed to-morrow, and no paper will be issued. We say, in compliance with the general usage, regarding this as the easiest way to avoid a controversy that might otherwise arise.

We could indeed exult that a Declaration of Independence was this day declared, avowing that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness," and that it is to secure these rights that "governments are instituted among men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*" We could also exult that among the reasons avowed in this Declaration for the step thus taken was the fact that the King of Great Britain had deprived our fathers, in many instances, of "*the benefits of trial by jury.*"

We say we could exult at these things; but surely we cannot exult that all these declarations have been repudiated by the Southern portion of the Republic, and that the whole instrument has been by champions of the South denominated 'a self-evident lie!"

We notice that some persons contemplate observing the anniversary as a day of mourning, and that they are bitterly denounced therefor. If they choose to contemplate the darker aspect of the subject, we cannot see how they can do otherwise than mourn. But we are optimists, and shall rejoice. Our subjects of contemplation shall be, not the miserable, evanescent triumphs of a bloated, overreaching Slave Power, soon to be rebuked and overwhelmed by the united voice of millions of freemen, but the conceded truths that "all men are created equal;" that they are endowed by their Creator "with certain unalienable rights;" and that among these rights are "life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness:" and, relying upon these truths, we will rejoice and hope, looking forward with confidence to the day in which the contemner of our glorious Declaration of Independence shall be execrated, as a self-evident ingrate and monster, and degraded to so low a depth of infamy, that even the scorn of his countrymen can never descend to him.

DEBATE IN THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT ON CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE.

The Earl of Ellenborough did not rise to oppose the second reading of this bill, but to express his opinion on a subject of greater importance. We made such progress last year in the work of concession to Canada, that the question now was, not whether we should stop in our career, still less whether we should attempt to go back, but whether we should not, in the most friendly spirit toward Canada and the other North American colonies, consult with their Legislatures on the expediency of taking measures for the complete release of those colonies from all dependence on the Crown and Parliament of Great Britain. He recollected having a conversation with Mr. Huskisson, in 1828, during the time that statesman held the seals of the Colonial office, in which he intimated most distinctly that the time had already arrived for the separation of Canada from this country, and Mr. Huskisson had even so maturely considered the matter, that he mentioned the form of Government which he thought it would be for our interest to have established in Canada when our connection with the colony should cease. It must be borne in mind that, during the last few years, a complete change had taken place in our relations with the North American colonies. In 1846 we repealed the corn laws, without reserving the privileges which Canada enjoyed under them. At a subsequent period we repealed the navigation laws, which gave us great advantages in matters of trade and navigation.

In addition to those measures, we had altered, to a great extent—if we had not entirely abolished—the discriminating duties on the staple produce of the North American colonies. Thus we have deprived ourselves and the North American colonies of the advantages which each formerly derived from the connection subsisting between them. For several years, too, in dealing with the Legislative Assemblies of the colonies, we had acted on a principle diametrically opposed to that which formerly influenced us; we had established in the colonies what was called responsible government, or, to speak more intelligibly, we had given them, practically, independent Governments. And, really, he could hardly imagine a situation more humiliating than that of the Representative of Her Majesty in Canada. It was almost wonderful a British gentleman would consent to hold such a situation of nullity, unless, indeed, from a consciousness of his own abilities and resources, he should think himself able to be, as Lord Metcalfe was, the Minister of the Colony. What was the use, what the practical advantage, of continuing our connection with the colonies?* The connection might be of some small use in time of peace; but, on the other hand, consider the danger arising from it in matters relating to war. There could be no doubt that the chances of collision between this country and the United States were greatly increased by our connection with the North American colonies. It was equally certain that in the event of war occurring between this country and the United States, on grounds totally unconnected with the colonies, they must, from their connection with us, be drawn into the war, and their whole frontier would be exposed to the greatest calamities. Under these circumstances, it was a matter worthy of serious consideration, whether we should not endeavor, in the most friendly manner, to divest ourselves of a connection which must prove equally onerous to both parties.

Now, in case of war, could we hope to defend the colonies successfully? He would advise, not the noble Duke opposite, who, to his great satisfaction, had been released from the duties of the Colonial office, but the Right Hon. Baronet who had succeeded him, to read a dispatch received from Lord Metcalfe in 1846. We were then, it was supposed, on the eve of a war with the United States—a war connected with matters in which Canada had no concern—a war for an object the value of which was not, to either party equal to the expense of one week's hostilities. Let the Colonial Secretary read Lord Metcalfe's dispatch, and see the amount of military aid which would be required to enable us successfully to defend Canada. At the time, he (Lord Ellenborough) thought Lord Metcalfe's estimate was extravagant, and he did not attach any great weight to that noble Lord's unsupported opinion; but, having consulted persons who from their position were most competent to decide upon the question, he found they confirmed Lord Metcalfe's estimate as to the amount of force necessary to defend Canada successfully, and it was utterly beyond the means of this country to provide it. It might be said we did successfully defend Canada in 1814, and that we had made great progress in wealth since. That he admitted, and he wished that he could add that we had made equal progress in military strength.

If, however, we had advanced in the career of prosperity, consider the enormous progress which the United States had made in their innumerable railroads, their well-appointed and well-disciplined army—an advantage which they did not formerly possess, for they conducted the war in 1814 with a mere rabble. Considering the increased strength and appliances at the command of the United States, it would hardly be possible to defend Canada with any hope of success. The very idea of a war with the United States was horrible. The event would be one of the greatest evils; one of the direst of human afflictions. Connected as we are in all the details of commerce, it would be more like tearing asunder the limbs of one human body than the collision of two separate bodies. Why, needlessly, increase the chances of war? Our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic are very ambitious, and extremely sensitive on the point of honor. So were we; and we were also extremely sensitive on the point of justice. Not only would we not endure injustice to ourselves, but we could not tolerate the perpetration of injustice to another.

These considerations should lead us to regard a rupture with the United States as an event which might happen at some period. Under these circumstances, he hoped that, at an early period, the Government would communicate with the leading persons in the Legislative Assemblies of the North American colonies, with the view of ascertaining their opinion on the subject of a separation. We should consult with them in the most friendly spirit, as if they were members of one and the same family, in which we felt a deep concern.

The Duke of Newcastle retorted, that he was astonished that the Earl of Ellenborough should propound opinions which would be as unpalatable to the people of the Colonies as they were to their lordships of that House. He (the Duke of Newcastle) would inform the noble Earl that he did not belong to a Government which would consent to making such proposals to the people of Canada. For his part, he looked upon such a proposal as an offence against the dignity and sovereignty of Britain, and hostile to the best interests of the colonists.

Lord Brougham asked why the Duke of Newcastle should so vehemently denounce the proposal of the separation of these colonies from the parent State? The proposal was not novel. It had been entertained and expressed by many eminent men. For himself, he would respectfully recommend to the people of Canada so to select the members of their second Chamber, that that Chamber should not be a mere duplicate of the Lower House.

The Duke of Newcastle replied, that the bill was a mere ennobling bill, and there was nothing in it to prevent the local Legislature from electing the members of the Upper House for life, or for a certain number of years.

The bill was then read a second time.

COLONEL FREMONT.

There is scarcely a man in the nation to whom a more romantic interest attaches than to him whose name we have written at the head of this article. The perils he has passed through, the dangers he has voluntarily encountered, and the discoveries he has made in the untrodden regions that stretch away from the western boundaries of Missouri and Arkansas, to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, all conspire to excite our admiration and win our respect. He has his ever-enduring monuments in the eternal mountain peaks, that rear their bald and bristling summits above the clouds, and which now bear his name. So circumstanced as to be able to live at his ease, or adorn courtly circles, or pass his life where statesmen and politicians "most do congregate," his bold and free spirit has scorned the twaddling of carpet knights, and the plots of politicians, and, amid savage wilds and howling wildernesses, over barren wastes of sand, or in the gorges of mountains, in the dead of winter, subsisting on the flesh of horses, or roaming on the broad prairie, where the savage lurks for his foe, he has carried the banner of the great Republic, gathered from barbarism and savage wastes themselves the knowledge that shall aid in making civilization a practical realization, and won the thanks and commendation of every lover of his country.

Louisville Times.

CONGRESSIONAL ROWS.—We regret that Mr. Millson did not persist in his determination to have an expression of opinion from the House of Representatives in regard to the recent discreditable scene between Messrs. Churchwell and Cullom. The use of violent and blasphemous language, and the exhibition of deadly weapons, on the floor of Congress, is getting to be a thing of ordinary and familiar occurrence. It is time for Congress to manifest some regard for its dignity, if it would command the respect of the country. An example must be made, and the sooner the better. Gen. Millson, himself the model of decorum and dignity, and possessing the universal esteem of members, was the very person to prosecute so outrageous a breach of the rules of the House.

Richmond Enquirer.

Illinois would make forty such States as Rhode Island, and Minnesota sixty. Missouri is larger than all New England. Ohio exceeds either Ireland, Scotland, or Portugal, and equals Scotland, Belgium, and Switzerland, together. Missouri is more than half as large as Italy, and larger than Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland. Missouri and Illinois are larger than England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales.—*Exchange.*

During Commodore Perry's late visit to Japan, himself and suite were entertained at a feast by the natives. Cooked worms, fried snakes, and a variety of indigestible compounds, were served up, of which they were obliged to partake through etiquette. Hereafter, a strong stomach may be considered as a high recommendation of our Japanese diplomatists.

NEW VERSION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. Giving ten millions of dollars to an usurper, who destroyed a Republic which reposed confidence in him, to enable an Empire to be established on the North American Continent.

New York National Democrat.

[BY HOUSE'S PRINTING TELEGRAPH.]

TELEGRAPHIC CORRESPONDENCE

FOR DAILY NATIONAL ERA.

The Markets.

BALTIMORE, JULY 3.—Flour—Howard Street $8, City Mills $8. Wheat—red $1.75, white $1.82. Corn—white 80 cents.

At Philadelphia and New York the flour and grain markets are quiet, with small sales.

Ohio River.

WHEELING, JULY 3.—Four feet of water in the channel—three feet at Pittsburg.

Cholera at Boston.

BOSTON, JULY 3.—There are reports of cholera cases. Four persons have died in one family.

From the South.

CHARLESTON, JULY 3.—Cotton market dull. Cotton and corn crops, hitherto promising, now endangered by great heat and drought.

At New Orleans and Mobile, to-day, cotton dull, and health generally good.

FUGITIVE SLAVE BILL.

SPEECH OF HON. CHARLES SUMNER,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

In the Senate of the United States, June 28, 1854.

The Senate having under consideration the motion to refer to the Committee on the Judiciary the Petition from twenty-nine hundred citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill—

Mr. SUMNER said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: Since I had the honor of addressing the Senate two days ago, various Senators have spoken. Among these, several have alluded to me in terms clearly beyond the sanctions of parliamentary debate. Of this I make no complaint, though, for the honor of the Senate at least, it were well that it were otherwise. If to them it seems fit, courteous, parliamentary,

—"to unpack the heart with words,
And fall a cursing, like a very drab,
A scullion,"

I will not interfere with the enjoyment which they find in such exposure of themselves. They have certainly given us a taste of their characters. Two of them, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] who sits immediately before me, and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON] who sits immediately behind me, are not young. Their heads are amply crowned by time. They did not speak from any ebullition of youth, but from the confirmed temper of age. It is melancholy to believe that, in this debate, they showed themselves as they are. It were charitable to believe that they are in reality better than they showed themselves.

I think, sir, that I am not the only person on this floor, who, in lately listening to these two self-confident champions of the peculiar fanaticism of the South, was reminded of the striking words by Jefferson, picturing the influence of slavery, where he says, "The whole commerce between 'master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the 'most boisterous passions, the most unremitting 'despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. Our children see this, and 'learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. The parent storms. The child looks on, 'catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the 'same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives 'loose to his worst passions, and, thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot 'but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. 'The man must be a prodigy who can retain his 'manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances." Nobody who witnessed the Senator from South Carolina or the Senator from Virginia in this debate will place either of them among the "prodigies" described by Jefferson. As they spoke, the Senate Chamber must have seemed, in the characteristic fantasy of the moment, a plantation well stocked with slaves, over which the lash of the overseer had free swing. Sir, it gives me no pleasure to say these things. It is not according to my nature. Bear witness, that I do it only in just self-defence against the unprecedented assaults and provocations of this debate. If Senators expect, by any ardor of menace or by any tyrannical frown, to shake my fixed resolve, they expect a vain thing.

There was, perhaps, little that fell from these two champions, as the fit was on, which deserves reply. Certainly not the hard words they used so readily and congenially. The veteran Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON] complained that I had characterized one of his "constituents," a person who went all the way from Virginia to Boston in pursuit of a slave, as a Slave-Hunter. Sir, I choose to call things by their right names. White I call white, and black I call black. And where a person degrades himself to the work of chasing a fellow-man, who, under the inspiration of freedom and the guidance of the north star, has sought a freeman's home far away from the coffle and the chain, that person, whomsoever he may be, I call a Slave-Hunter. If the Senator from Virginia, who professes nicety of speech, will give me any term which more precisely describes such a person, I will use it. Until then I shall continue to use the language which seems to me so apt. But this very sensibility of the veteran Senator at a just term, which truly depicts an odious character, shows a shame in which I exult. It was said by one of the philosophers of antiquity, that the blush is a sign of virtue; and permit me to add, that, in this violent sensibility, I recognise a blush mantling the cheek of the Senator, which even his plantation manners cannot conceal.

And the venerable Senator from South Carolina, too, [Mr. BUTLER;] he has betrayed his sensibility. Here let me say that this Senator knows well that I always listen with peculiar pleasure to his racy and exuberant speech, as it gurgles forth—sometimes tinctured by generous ideas—except when, forgetful of history, and in defiance of reason, he undertakes to defend that which is obviously indefensible. This Senator was disturbed, when to his inquiry, personally, pointedly, and vehemently addressed to me, whether I would join in returning a fellow-man to slavery, I exclaimed, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?" In fitful phrases, which seemed to come from the unconscious excitement so common with the Senator, he shot forth various remarks about "dogs;" and, among other things, asked if there was any "dog" in the Constitution? The Senator did not seem to bear in mind, through the heady currents of that moment, that, by the false interpretation he has given to the Constitution, he has helped to nurture there a whole kennel of Carolina bloodhounds, trained, with savage jaws and inexorable scent, for the hunt of flying bondmen. No, sir. I do not believe that there is any "kennel of bloodhounds," or even any "dog," in the Constitution of the United States.

But, Mr. President, since the brief response which I made to the inquiry of the Senator, and which leaped unconsciously to my lips, has drawn upon me various attacks, all marked by grossness of language and manner; since I have been charged with openly declaring my purpose to violate the Constitution, and to break the oath which I have taken at that desk, I shall be pardoned for showing simply how a few plain words will put all this down. The authentic report in the *Globe* shows what was actually said. The report in the *Sentinel* is substantially the same; and one of the New York papers, which has been put into my hands since I entered the Senate Chamber to-day, under its telegraphic head, states the incident with substantial accuracy, though it omits the personal individual appeal addressed to me by the Senator, and which is preserved in the *Globe*. Here is the New York report:

"Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the Senator, 'if Congress repealed the Fugitive Slave Law, 'would Massachusetts execute the constitutional 'requirements, and send back to the South the 'absconding slaves?

"Mr. SUMNER. Do you ask if I would send back 'a slave?

"Mr. BUTLER. Why, yes.

"Mr. SUMNER. "Is thy servant a dog, that he 'should do this thing?"

To any candid mind, either of these reports renders anything further superfluous. But the Senators who have been so swift in misrepresentation deserve to be exposed, and it shall be done.

Now, sir, I begin by adopting as my guide the authoritative words of Andrew Jackson, in his memorable veto, in 1832, of the Bank of the United States. To his course, at that critical time, were opposed the authority of the Supreme Court *and his oath to support the Constitution.* Here is his triumphant reply:

"If the opinion of the Supreme Court covers 'the whole ground of this act, it ought not to 'control the co-ordinate authorities of this Government. The Congress, the Executive, and the 'Court, must each for itself be guided by its own 'opinion of the Constitution. *Each public officer, 'who takes an oath to support the Constitution, 'swears that he will support it as he understands it, 'and not as it is understood by others.* It is as 'much the duty of the House of Representatives, 'of the Senate, and of the President, to decide 'upon the constitutionality of any bill or resolution, which may be presented to them for passage or approval, as it is of the supreme judges 'when it may be brought before them for judicial 'decision. The authority of the Supreme Court 'must not, therefore, be permitted to control the 'Congress or the Executive, when acting in their 'legislative capacities, but to have only such influence as the force of their reasoning may deserve."

Mark these words, and let them sink into your minds. "Each public officer, who takes an oath to support the Constitution, swears that he will support it as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others." Yes, sir, AS HE UNDERSTANDS IT, *and not as it is understood by others.* Does any Senator here dissent from this rule? Does the Senator from Virginia? Does the Senator from South Carolina? [Here Mr. SUMNER paused, but there was no reply.] At all events, I accept the rule as just and reasonable; in harmony, too, let me assert, with that liberty which scorns the dogma of *passive obedience,* and asserts the inestimable right of private judgment, whether in religion or politics. In swearing to support the Constitution at your desk, Mr. President, I did not swear to support it as *you* understand it. Oh, no, sir. Or as the Senator from Virginia understands it. Oh, no, sir. Or as the Senator from South Carolina understands it, with a kennel of bloodhounds; or, at least, a "dog" in it, "pawing to get free its hinder parts," in pursuit of a slave. No such thing. Sir, I swore to support the Constitution *as I understand it;* nor more, nor less.

Now, I will not occupy your time, nor am I so disposed at this moment, nor does the occasion require it, by entering upon any minute criticism of the clause in the Constitution touching the surrender of "fugitives from labor." A few words only are needful. Assuming, sir, in the face of commanding rules of interpretation, all leaning towards freedom, that in the evasive language of this clause, paltering in a double sense, the words employed can be judicially regarded as justly applicable to fugitive slaves, which, as you ought to know, sir, is often most strenuously and conscientiously denied—thus sponging the whole clause out of existence, except as a provision for the return of persons actually bound by lawful contract, but on which I now express no opinion; assuming, I say, this interpretation, so hostile to freedom, and derogatory to the members of the Federal Convention, who solemnly declared that they would not yield any sanction to slavery, or admit into the Constitution the idea of property in man; assuming, I repeat, an interpretation which every principle of the common law, claimed by our fathers as their birthright, must disown; admitting, for the moment only, and with shame, that the Constitution of the United States has any words, which, in any legal intendment, can constrain fugitive slaves, then I desire to say, that, as I understand the Constitution, this clause does not impose upon me, as a Senator or citizen, any obligation to take part, directly or indirectly, in the surrender of a fugitive slave.

Sir, as a Senator, I have taken at your desk the oath to support the Constitution, *as I understand it.* And understanding it as I do, I am bound by that oath, Mr. President, to oppose all enactments by Congress on the subject of fugitive slaves, as a flagrant violation of the Constitution; especially must I oppose the last act as a tyrannical usurpation, kindred in character to the Stamp Act, which our fathers indignantly refused to obey. Here my duties, under the oath which I have taken as a Senator, end. There is nothing beyond. They are all absorbed in the constant, inflexible, righteous obligation to oppose every exercise by Congress of any power over the subject. In no respect, by that oath, can I be constrained to duties *in other capacities, or as a simple citizen,* especially when revolting to my conscience. Now, in this interpretation of the Constitution I may be wrong; others may differ from me; the Senator from Virginia may differ from me, and the Senator from South Carolina also; and they will, each and all, act according to their respective understandings. For myself, I shall act according to mine. On this explicit statement of my constitutional obligations, I stand, as upon a living rock, and, to the inquiry, in whatever form addressed to my personal responsibility, whether I would aid, directly or indirectly, in reducing or surrendering a fellow-man to bondage, I reply again, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?"

And, sir, looking round upon this Senate, I might ask fearlessly, how many there are, even in this body, if, indeed, there be a single Senator, who would stoop to any such service? Until some one rises and openly confesses his willingness to become a Slave-Hunter, I will not believe there can be one. [Here Mr. SUMNER paused, but nobody rose.] And yet honorable and chivalrous Senators have rushed headlong to denounce me, because I openly declared my repudiation of a service at which every manly bosom must revolt. "Sire, I have found in Bayonne brave soldiers and good citizens, *but not one executioner,*" was the noble reply of the Governor of that place to Charles IX of France, after the royal edict for the massacre of St. Bartholomew; and such a spirit, I trust, will yet animate the people of this country, when pressed to the service of "dogs!"

To that other question, which has been proposed, whether Massachusetts, by State laws, will carry out the offensive clause in the Constitution, according to the understanding of the venerable Senator from South Carolina, I reply that Massachusetts, at all times, has been ready to do her duty under the Constitution, as she understands it; and, I doubt not, will ever continue of this mind. More than this I cannot say.

In quitting this topic, I cannot forbear to remark that the assault on me for my disclaimer of all constitutional obligation, resting upon me as a Senator or citizen, to aid in making a man a slave, or in surrendering him to slavery, comes with an ill grace from the veteran Senator from Virginia, a State which, by its far-famed resolutions of 1798, assumed to determine its constitutional obligations, even to the extent of openly declaring two different acts of Congress null and void; and it comes also with an ill grace from the venerable Senator from South Carolina, a State which, in latter days, has arrayed itself openly against the Federal authorities, and which threatens nullification as often as babies cry.

Surely the Senator from South Carolina, with his silver-white locks, would have hesitated to lead this assault upon me, had he not, for the moment, been entirely oblivious, of the history of the State which he represents. Not many years have passed since an incident occurred at Charleston, in South Carolina—not at Boston, in Massachusetts—which ought to be remembered. The postmaster of that place, acting under a controlling public opinion there, informed the head of his Department at Washington that he had determined to suppress all *anti-slavery* publications, and requested instructions for the future. Thus, in violation of the laws of the land, the very mails were rifled, and South Carolina smiled approbation of the outrage. But this is not all. The Postmaster General, Mr. Kendall, after prudently alleging that, as he had not seen the papers in question, he could not give an opinion of their character, proceeded to say, that he had been *informed* that they were incendiary, inflammatory, and insurrectionary, and then announced:

"By no act or direction of mine, official or private, could I be induced to aid knowingly in 'giving circulation to papers of this description, 'directly or indirectly. *We owe an obligation to 'the laws,* but a *higher* one to the communities in 'which we live; and if the former be perverted 'to destroy the latter, *it is patriotism to disregard 'them.* Entertaining these views, I cannot sanction, and will not condemn, the step you have 'taken."

Such was the approving response of the National Government to the Postmaster of Charleston, when, for the sake of Slavery, and without any constitutional scruple, he set himself against an acknowledged law of the land; yet the Senator from South Carolina now presumes to denounce me, when, for the sake of freedom, and in the honest interpretation of my constitutional obligations, I decline an offensive service.

But there is another incident in the history of South Carolina, which, as a loyal son of Massachusetts, I cannot forget, and which rises now in judgment against the venerable Senator. Massachusetts had commissioned a distinguished gentleman, of blameless life and eminent professional qualities, who served with honor in the other House, [Hon. SAMUEL HOAR,] to reside at Charleston for a brief period, in order to guard the rights of her free colored citizens, assailed